

SC-00634/59

Copy 4

6 February 1959

MEMORANDUM FOR: Deputy Director (Plans)

SUBJECT : Revision of Highest Priority Requirements

1. Attached for your information is a copy of our revision of the Highest Priority Requirements (SC-00633/59, 5 February 1959). It has, of course, been provided to Operations DPD-DD/P, and I am taking copies of it with me for my discussions with [REDACTED] and his committee as necessary. In our view, of course, these are recommended by us regardless of who files, and if indeed, as I suspect, [REDACTED] wishes to bring his committee together for discussion while I am there, I am fully aware that only [REDACTED] is cleared for [REDACTED].

25X1A9a
25X1A9a
25X1A9a
25X1A2g

2. In preparing the new list, we have asked the question: If permission were given for only one flight, what would be the targets that we would recommend. It is in this sense that we chose the MOST CRITICAL list. I recognize that these cannot be covered in one mission, but they are all included because I could not get agreement on any one. The Army, Navy, and JCS (who, you recall, now have representation on the ARC) very strongly believe that if you had to choose between TYURA TAM and KAPUSTIN YAR test ranges in the Urals the former would give the most valuable information on the ICBM questions. The DD/I (OCI, ORR, OSI) and the Air Force believe the Urals is the place to go and tend to play down the value of the test areas. Both groups recognize that they could be wrong and their judgments are but educated guesses. I look forward to the chance to explore the [REDACTED] view on these questions in the light of the argument that I have heard from the two sides.

25X1X7

3. The CRITICAL list, still within Highest Priority Requirements, is presented without order of priority simply because I could get no agreement on such (and I appreciate such agreement may not be necessary). Each section to a considerable degree represents a principal preoccupation of the various departments. In this list, ICBM means the most to the Army, subs to the Navy, long range bomber to the Air Force, and atomic energy to OSI, and ICBM production to ORR who holds with the firmest conviction

25X1X7

that SVERDLOVSK is probably ICBM production though others are not so convinced. DNEPROPETROVSK (DAZ) is the ICBM production location held by [REDACTED] which ORR discounts entirely.

4. Admiral Burke, according to Ed Nielsen of the Navy, feels very strongly about SEVERODVINSK (MOLOTOVSK). He could not possibly have gone "home" without the footnote on page 1 of the tab.

5. The foregoing description of the disagreements within the ARC leaves me a bit disappointed, but it does represent the reality and exists in spite of our extended review and argument. I do consider that this matter has been very thoroughly canvassed,

25X1A9a

[REDACTED]
JAMES Q. REBER
Chairman
Ad Hoc Requirements Committee

Attachment
SC-00633/59 cy 1

cc: Deputy Director DPD-DD/P (cy 2) w/o att
Director of Operations DPD-DD/P (cy 3) w/o att

DPD-DD/P: JQReber: cw
DPD-DD/P (cys 4&5)